

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
CASE NO.:**

NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO,

Plaintiff,

v.

SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC. and  
A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO  
SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD  
SUPERMARKET,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC. and A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET (hereinafter “Defendants”), and as grounds alleges:

**JURISDICTION, PARTIES, AND VENUE**

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq., (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

4. At all times material, Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., owned and

operated a commercial plaza property at 5163 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137 (hereinafter the “commercial plaza property” or “commercial property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami, Florida.

5. At all times material, Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company which is registered to conduct business in the State of Florida and has the principal place of business listed in this complaint in Miami, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC. d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, owned and operated a commercial supermarket at 5299 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter the “supermarket,” or “commercial supermarket”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami, Florida.

7. At all times material, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC. d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, was and is a Florida For Profit Corporation, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida

8. At all times material, Defendant, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC. d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, was and is a Florida For Profit Corporation, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

9. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendant’s commercial property, supermarket, and businesses are located in Miami-Dade County, Florida;

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET’s place of public accommodation sits within the commercial shopping plaza anchored at 5163 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137 and owned by the Co-Defendant and Landlord, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC.

Defendants regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida; and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Although well over thirty-two (32) years has passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendant has yet to make its/their facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

11. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendant has continued to discriminate against people who is disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendant's property and the businesses therein.

12. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

13. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO uses a wheelchair to ambulate. NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO has very limited use of his hands and cannot operate any mechanisms which require tight grasping or twisting of the wrist. He has lower paraplegia, which inhibits him from walking or otherwise ambulating without the use of a wheelchair. He is limited in his major life activities by such, including but not limited to walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

14. Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., owns, operates and/or oversees the Commercial Plaza Property; to include its general parking lot, parking spots, and entrance

access and path of travel specific to the tenant businesses therein and all other common areas open to the public located within the Commercial Property.

15. Defendant, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC. d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, owns, operates and oversees the commercial supermarket within the Co-Defendant's subject commercial property, which is open to the public located within the commercial plaza property.

16. The subject commercial plaza property and supermarket are open to the public and are located in Miami, Florida. The individual Plaintiff visits the commercial property, to include a visit to the commercial property and businesses located within the commercial property on July 23, 2024, and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the commercial property. He often visits the commercial plaza property and businesses located within the commercial property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately thirty-three (33) miles from his residence and is near other businesses that he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the commercial plaza property within two (2) months from the date of the filing of this Complaint.

17. The Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, found the commercial plaza property and commercial supermarket business located within the commercial property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the commercial plaza property and commercial supermarket business located within the commercial property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of the premises.

18. The Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, has encountered architectural barriers that is in violation of the ADA at the subject commercial plaza property and supermarket. The barriers to access at Defendants' commercial property and commercial

supermarket business has each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the commercial property and supermarket and has endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which is set forth below, has likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, and others similarly situated.

19. The Defendants, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC. and A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, each own and operate a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. The Defendants are jointly and severally responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The places of public accommodation that they respectively own and operate are the commercial property and supermarket located at 5163 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137 and 5299 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137<sup>2</sup>, which is within the subject commercial plaza.

20. Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., owns and operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., as the owner of the commercial plaza and landlord, is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The supermarket business and place of public accommodation that Defendant, A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, owns and operates as a tenant is a commercial supermarket business located at 5299 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137 and as the owner of this business and a tenant is also jointly and severally responsible for ADA compliance for this place of public accommodation.

21. Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., as landlord and owner of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Again, the latter address of the supermarket sits within the commercial plaza property owned by Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC.

commercial property, is jointly and severally liable for all ADA violations listed in this Complaint with its Tenant, Co-Defendant A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET.

22. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described commercial property and supermarket, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the commercial property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the commercial property and supermarket business located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the commercial property, but to assure himself that the commercial property is in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the commercial property without fear of discrimination.

23. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the commercial property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

**COUNT I – ADA VIOLATIONS**  
**AS TO SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC.**

**FOR COMMON AREAS**

24. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 23 above as though fully set forth herein.

25. Defendant, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC., has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer

employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

**Entrance Access and Path of Travel**

i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.

ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are cross slopes in excess of 2%. Violation: The path of travel contains excessive cross slopes in violation of Section 4.3.7 of the ADAAG and Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty using ramps, as they are located on an excessive slope. Violation: Ramps at the facility contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.8.2 of the ADAAG and Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty on the path of travel at the facility, as ramps do not have compliant handrails violating Section 4.8.5 of the ADAAG and Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

v. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are vertical changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

vi. There are objects on the path of travel that protrude more than the maximum allowable, violating Section 4.4.1 of ADAAG and Section 307.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT II – ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC AND A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET**

26. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 23 above as though fully set forth herein.

27. Defendants, SABAL PALM ENTERPRISES, INC and A & R FOOD CHAIN INC d/b/a BRAVO SABAL SUPERMARKET aka KEY FOOD SUPERMARKET, have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

**Public Restrooms**

i. The restroom signage is not mounted at the required location, violating Section 4.30.6 of the ADAAG and Section 703.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

ii. The Plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as the required knee & toe clearances are not provided. Violation: There are lavatories in public restrooms without the required clearances provided, violating the requirements in Section 4.19.2 and Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Sections 306 and 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.



iii. The Plaintiff could not use the soap dispenser without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are dispensers provided for public use in the restroom, with controls outside the ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.27.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 & 309.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

iv. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear grab bar is missing and the side grab bar is not the required length. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 & Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5 & 609.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

v. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as a trashcan obstructs the clear floor space. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

vi. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the toilet without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required distance from the side wall. Violation: The water closet is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the side wall, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG and Section 604.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

#### **RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS**

28. The discriminatory violations described in this Complaint is not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, from further

ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the commercial place of public accommodation and supermarket; Plaintiff requests to be allowed to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein is readily achievable.

29. The Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, has been denied access to, and has been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendants' commercial plaza property and commercial supermarket business within the property; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff further requests a remediation plan and the opportunity to participate in the crafting of the remediation plan in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

30. Defendants have discriminated against the Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of their places of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Defendants have also discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12131 et seq. and 28 C.F.R. Part 35 et seq for excluding Plaintiff by reason of disability from participation in and denying him benefits of the services,

programs, or activities of a public entity. Furthermore, the Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications is necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

31. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and has a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

32. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

33. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent has been met by the Plaintiff or waived by the Defendants.

34. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant

Plaintiff's Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their businesses, to include the supermarket shop (at 5299 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137) located within the commercial property located at 5163 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Miami, Florida 33137, the interiors, exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the commercial property and businesses located within it and to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure its violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) Injunctive relief against Defendants, including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications is necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (ii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 ; and (iii) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: September 27, 2024

**ANTHONY J. PEREZ LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
7950 W. Flagler Street, Suite 104  
Miami, Florida 33144  
Telephone: (786) 361-9909  
Facsimile: (786) 687-0445

Primary E-Mail: [ajp@ajperezlawgroup.com](mailto:ajp@ajperezlawgroup.com)  
Secondary E-Mails: [jr@ajperezlawgroup.com](mailto:jr@ajperezlawgroup.com)

By:     /s/ Anthony J. Perez      
ANTHONY J. PEREZ  
Florida Bar No.: 535451